More Women on Faculties; Pay Still Lags

WASHINGTON

Although the hiring of female faculty members increased in the past academic year, the total number of women on college and university faculties, like their salaries and tenure rates, remained substantially lower than those of their male colleagues.

The National Center for Education Statistics reports that the number of women employed as full-time faculty members on nine-month contracts grew by more than 2 per cent in 1979-80. For men, the one-year increase was less than half of 1 per cent.

Among faculty members with 12-month contracts, the number of women increased 3.6 per cent, while the number of men increased only 1 per cent.

Even so, women held only about a fourth of the full-time faculty jobs in 1979-80, according to the N.C.E.S. report.

Fewer Women in Top Ranks

Women are much scarcer at the top of the academic ladder than at the bottom

Among full-time faculty members on nine-month contracts, the N.C.E.S. report shows, women account for half of the instructors, a third of the assistant professors, a fifth of the associate professors, and fewer than a tenth of the full professors.

Their salaries averaged $17,922 in 1979-80, about 18 per cent less than the average for men.

Among faculty members employed on 12-month contracts, women received 26 per cent less than their male colleagues.

The salary gap between men and women exists at all levels and at all types of institutions, the N.C.E.S. report says.

The difference between men's and women's salaries tends to be greater at universities than at four-year or two-year colleges. Men on university faculties earn nearly one-third more than women, on the average.

Besides having higher average salaries, men on college and university faculties tend to get larger pay raises than women.

The N.C.E.S. reports that raises received by the men on nine-month faculty contracts averaged 7.4 per cent in 1979-80, compared with an average of 6.9 per cent for women.

Majority of Women Lack Tenure

Academic tenure was granted to more than 68 per cent of the men on college and university faculties in 1979-80, and to only 48 per cent of the women.

Compared with the previous year, the number of men with tenure increased 0.9 per cent; the number of women with tenure, 1.2 per cent.

Spending by colleges and universities for retirement benefits for faculty members of both sexes on nine-month contracts averaged $1,769 per person.

Other average expenditures for fringe benefits for each faculty member included $627 for hospitalization, $120 for disability, $1,107 for tuition benefits, $709 for housing benefits, $130 for unemployment compensation, $116 for group life insurance, and $95 for workmen's compensation.

State-by-state averages for faculty salaries, on a nine-month basis, showed Alaska with the highest—$29,772, followed by $25,096 for California, $24,045 for Arizona, and $23,371 for Nevada.

The lowest state average was $16,964 in South Dakota, followed by $17,396 in Mississippi, $17,813 in Arkansas, and $18,102 in West Virginia.

The N.C.E.S. report is based on preliminary data from 2,242 colleges, universities, and branches—about 70 per cent of the U. S. total.

—JACK MAGARRELL

FACT–FILE

Status of Female Faculty Members, 1979-80

Men and women compared in number, salary level, and percentage with tenure

Average salaries of full-time faculty members, 1979-80

	Professors		Associate professors		Assistant professors		Instructors		Lecturers		All ranks	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Public and private, 9-month contracts												
Universities	$30,561	$27,367	$22,386	$21,101	$18,210	$17,232	$14,272	$13,718	$16,327	$14,337	$24,423	$18,616
Other 4-year	25,416	23,676	20,488	19,410	17,011	16,265	14,042	13,397	15,403	13,446	20,403	17,120
2-year	24 031	22,961	20,862	20,334	17,665	17,009	15,570	14,224	15,940	13,423	20,765	18,672
All 9-month contracts	27,994	24,764	21,262	20,070	17,504	16,656	14,433	13,634	15,953	13,921	21,941	17,922
Public and Private, 12-month contracts												
Universities	$36,856	$34,072	$28,863	$26,579	$24,320	$22,113	$19,036	$16,752	$22,314	$19,305	$30,676	$23,203
Other 4-year	31,759	27,965	26,149	23,494	21,164	19,330	15,763	15,042	17,630	15,426	25,240	19,371
2-year	26,594	24,427	23,229	21,988	19,541	18,205	16,166	14,516	17,471	16,608	19,904	17,473
All 12-month contracts	34,896	30,190	27,421	24,459	22,771	20,233	16,716	15,328	21,339	18,173	27,039	19,816

Increase in salaries, 1979-80 compared with 1978-79

	Professors		Associate professors		Assistant professors		Instructors		Lecturers		All ranks	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Private institutions												
Universities	7.7%	8.4%	6.8%	7.3%	7.0%	6.4%	5.2%	4.9%	12.1%	7.9%	7.6%	7.1%
Other 4-year	6.8%	6.9%	6.6%	6.2%	6.2%	6.3%	6.5%	5.8%	4.5%	5.6%	7.0%	6.6%
2-year	9.7%	8.4%	7.5%	5.6%	5.7%	6.6%	5.5%	7.1%	—	—	7.2%	5.5%
Total private	7.1%	7.4%	6.7%	6.6%	6.5%	6.4%	6.0%	5.7%	9.5%	7.4%	7.3%	6.7%
Public institutions												
Universities	6.5%	5.5%	6.5%	5.6%	6.3%	5.2%	4.8%	4.3%	5.0%	4.8%	6.9%	6.1%
Other 4-year	6.3%	5.4%	6.9%	6.4%	6.7%	6.8%	7.6%	6.5%	9.6%	6.8%	7.4%	7.2%
2-year	5.4%	4.3%	5.1%	6.1%	6.0%	5.2%	6.8%	5.1%	—	—	8.2%	7.6%
Total public	6.2%	5.3%	6.5%	6.1%	6.5%	6.1%	6.7%	5.6%	7.2%	5.8%	7.4%	7.0%

Change in number of full-time faculty members, 1979-80 compared with 1978-79

	Professors		Associate professors		Assistant professors		Instructors		Lecturers		All ranks	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
9-month contracts												
Universities	+ 3.0%	+ 5.8%	+ 0.6%	+ 8.5%	− 1.9%	+ 1.2%	− 4.2%	− 0.8%	+ 7.8%	+ 9.0%	+ 0.9%	+ 3.5%
Other 4-year	+ 4.8%	+ 4.4%	+ 0.6%	+ 6.0%	− 3.6%	+ 2.1%	− 4.3%	− 4.7%	− 1.2%	+ 1.6%	+ 0.2%	+ 2.0%
2-year	+ 11.7%	+ 9.1%	+ 3.2%	+ 7.8%	− 3.5%	0.0%	− 7.1%	− 5.9%	− 7.4%	+ 2.3%	+ 0.1%	+ 1.2%
All 9-month contracts	+ 4.1%	+ 5.3%	+ 0.8%	+ 7.1%	− 3.0%	+ 1.6%	− 4.8%	− 4.0%	+ 3.8%	+ 5.8%	+ 0.4%	+ 2.2%
12-month contracts												
Universities	− 0.7%	− 2.3%	− 2.4%	0.0%	− 1.0%	− 3.9%	− 11.3%	− 7.5%	+ 11.0%	+ 28.7%	− 0.8%	− 0.2%
Other 4-year	+ 4.3%	− 1.5%	+ 2.5%	− 0.7%	+ 0.3%	+ 3.3%	− 12.4%	+ 0.9%	+ 8.1%	+ 3.6%	+ 2.1%	+ 4.8%
2-year	+ 8.9%	+ 13.0%	− 3.6%	+ 5.9%	+ 2.3%	+ 8.5%	+ 26.8%	+ 19.0%	0.0%	− 14.3%	+ 4.9%	+ 6.3%
All 12-month contracts	+ 1.0%	− 1.0%	− 0.9%	+ 0.5%	− 0.3%	+ 0.8%	− 5.5%	+ 1.3%	+ 10.3%	+ 22.0%	+ 1.0%	+ 3.6%

Women as percentage of total full-time faculty members

	Professors		Associate professors		Assistant professors		Instructors		Lecturers		All ranks	
	9-month	12-month	9-month	12-month	9-month	12-month	9-month	12-month	9-month	12-month	9-month	12-month
Private institutions												
Universities	6.0%	6.8%	16.6%	22.7%	30.0%	35.5%	48.6%	71.4%	42.1%	43.9%	18.2%	26.5%
Other 4-year	12.7%	10.1%	21.6%	21.2%	35.4%	32.8%	51.0%	46.0%	49.9%	73.7%	27.4%	26.9%
2-year	29.6%	23.3%	42.7%	32.5%	52.9%	39.8%	57.4%	53.8%	—	—	48.6%	41.3%
Total private	10.1%	9.3%	20.3%	22.1%	34.2%	33.9%	51.0%	50.8%	45.2%	55.8%	24.8%	28.1%
Public institutions												
Universities	6.4%	4.7%	16.2%	11.9%	31.1%	21.2%	55.7%	44.7%	44.4%	39.3%	20.0%	13.7%
Other 4-year	11.8%	12.4%	18.9%	21.2%	34.5%	40.4%	52.7%	61.1%	46.4%	44.3%	26.4%	28.8%
2-year	23.5%	17.8%	29.4%	30.6%	38.6%	41.6%	47.7%	47.3%	46.1%	47.4%	34.7%	36.1%
Total public	9.7%	7.2%	19.1%	16.8%	33.8%	29.6%	52.1%	51.5%	45.3%	40.5%	26.4%	23.2%
Public and private combined												
Universities	6.3%	4.9%	16.3%	13.4%	31.8%	23.2%	54.2%	49.9%	43.9%	39.9%	19.6%	15.4%
Other 4-year	12.2%	11.5%	19.9%	21.2%	34.9%	37.3%	52.0%	53.2%	47.4%	53.2%	26.8%	28.0%
2-year	23.8%	18.4%	29.9%	30.8%	39.1%	41.4%	48.4%	48.9%	47.4%	47.4%	35.2%	36.6%
Total public and private	9.8%	7.6%	19.4%	18.0%	33.9%	30.7%	51.8%	51.3%	44.7%	43.0%	25.9%	24.3%

Percentage of full-time faculty members with tenure, 1979-80

	Professors		Associate professors		Assistant professors		Instructors		Lecturers		All ranks	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Private institutions												
Universities	97.0%	95.4%	75.9%	74.1%	13.1%	13.8%	5.5%	2.5%	2.9%	2.3%	66.4%	35.9%
Other 4-year	93.7%	90.9%	77.3%	75.0%	21.3%	21.9%	2.7%	2.4%	0.8%	0.0%	60.4%	37.9%
2-year	93.9%	89.7%	86.3%	70.0%	42.1%	32.1%	7.5%	9.7%	0.0%	0.0%	55.2%	37.9%
Total private	95.1%	92.0%	76.9%	74.7%	19.0%	19.9%	3.4%	2.7%	2.2%	1.4%	62.4%	37.4%
Public institutions												
Universities	97.0%	95.4%	86.4%	85.4%	17.2%	25.0%	6.7%	7.8%	11.0%	8.7%	70.6%	43.6%
Other 4-year	96.1%	95.1%	84.3%	81.9%	37.0%	39.6%	11.9%	10.7%	1.2%	0.5%	68.3%	47.5%
2-year	95.9%	96.6%	89.5%	88.8%	59.1%	56.2%	26.0%	21.6%	10.3%	2.9%	77.9%	67.1%
Total public	96.6%	95.4%	85.7%	84.4%	31.1%	36.9%	13.8%	12.2%	7.7%	5.7%	71.1%	51.9%
Public and private combined												
Universities	97.0%	95.4%	84.1%	82.7%	16.2%	22.2%	6.4%	6.5%	9.4%	7.6%	69.7%	41.7%
Other 4-year	95.1%	93.4%	81.7%	79.2%	30.9%	32.7%	8.3%	7.6%	1.1%	0.4%	65.3%	43.8%
2-year	95.8%	96.2%	89.4%	88.0%	58.6%	55.3%	24.8%	20.8%	10.3%	2.4%	77.2%	65.8%
Total public and private	96.2%	94.4%	83.3%	81.5%	27.5%	31.7%	10.8%	9.6%	6.7%	4.9%	68.7%	48.0%

SOURCE: NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

Aim Adult Training at Workers and Poorly Educated, Study Recommends

By Beverly T. Watkins

HUNT VALLEY, MD.

Adults with little formal education—often members of low-income and minority groups—are the least likely to participate in continuing-education and training programs.

According to a new study, only 3.3 per cent of adults with less than a high-school education take part in educational activities, while 26.5 per cent of those who have completed four years of college are involved in adult learning at any given time.

The educational participation of black adults is considerably below that of whites, says the study, conducted by the National Institute for Work and Learning, a Washington-based policy-research organization.

Today, 6.5 per cent of black adults are enrolled in some learning activity, compared with 12.2 per cent of whites. Participation by blacks has declined steadily over the last 10 years, according to the study, which was financed by the National Institute of Education.

The research project, which concentrated on adult education and training available to workers through their companies, unions, and educational institutions, found that participation in learning increased with income. About 5.3 per cent of those with annual incomes under $5,000 are engaged in educational programs, compared with 17.5 per cent of those earning $25,000 or more.

The study also found, among other things, that an increasing number of women—12.5 per cent today compared with 9.9 per cent a decade ago—were in educational and training programs. However, since so few women hold jobs that require additional training, they are less likely to have access to education on the job.

Continuing education is essential for adults who must adapt to the broad social and economic changes now under way, said Paul E. Barton, the institute's vice-president for planning and policy development and author of the study report. However, he said, if learning is to enable members of society to cope with those changes, educational opportunities must be "equally accessible."

"There is a developing consensus in the country among informed people that change will take place through the education process," said Willard Wirtz, chairman of the institute, at a conference held last week at the conclusion of the four-year project.

"Adult education is more effective if it is emphasized in terms of work life," Mr. Wirtz told representatives of federal and state governments, business and industry, labor unions, and postsecondary educational institutions who assembled to discuss the study's findings and policy recommendations.

He said the research project indicated that "women and seniors are profiting greatly from adult education, but I'm not sure how much we've done for minorities and the unemployed. The next step is to focus on those constituencies."

In its preliminary form, the project report includes more than 50 policy recommendations, many designed to increase access to education and training for workers from low-income and minority groups. Among them:

▶ Channel more information about education and training opportunities to workers through organizations that reach the working classes, such as the U. S. Employment Service, labor unions, and neighborhood associations.

▶ Designate selected company personnel and union officials as "learning organizers" to provide educational advice and information to workers at job sites during the workday.

▶ Establish a National Educational Information Coordinating Committee to develop educational information, brokering, and advisement services for adults.

▶ Conduct pilot projects on child-care arrangements, "flextime," installment or deferred tuition payments, and class schedules and locations to find ways to overcome these barriers to participation in education.

▶ Eliminate restrictions in state constitutions and public-education laws that require persons to take 12 years of public education before age 22 or forfeit the right to free elementary and secondary education.

▶ Set up councils with representatives from public agencies, private companies, labor unions, and educational institutions to develop federally financed programs to prepare low-income unemployed adults and workers displaced by economic change for jobs in the private sector.

The institute's report, "Worklife Transitions: The Learning Connection," is scheduled to be published by McGraw-Hill Publishing Company next spring.

Clark Kerr *Continued from Preceding Page*

sored research studies provided new information or new ways of looking at old information. Perhaps worthy of special note is the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, now widely used and being perpetuated by the American Council on Education, which is taking it over and will keep it up to date [*A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education* (1973); and *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, Revised Edition* (1976)].

10. Creating a running commentary on developments within higher education.

This commentary sought to rely upon competently analyzed facts, to discuss problems in constructive ways, to avoid apocalyptic judgments, to give a sense of assurance that what was being done was worth doing and had a future, to reaffirm basic academic values, to state that higher education was not just a helpless victim of forces beyond its control, to set a civil tone for argument, to hold out some hopes and set forth many possibilities for actions, and to fortify the sense of purpose of higher education.

In providing this running commentary, the commission and the council helped to set the agenda for discussion within and outside of higher education, and to supply facts, ideas, and analyses for this discussion.

■

The commission and the council ended, as they began, with the belief that an independent, but basically supportive, study of higher education could make contributions to the welfare of higher education and of society; and perhaps also, at least to a modified degree, with the belief that it is better to err—if err one must—on the side of optimism, charitable faith in others, and the availability of at least partial solutions than to err in the direction of pessimism, cynicism, and defeat; and with the belief that a counterbalance was helpful, under the circumstances of the times, to the dominant atmosphere of gloom, criticism, and anticipatory acceptance of failure.

Both the commission and the council believed that, while higher education needed major reforms, it had many past achievements to its credit and many contributions still to be made in the future; that it was increasingly indispensable to the advancement of the welfare of society.

They also acted on the belief that "Nothing great was ever achieved without enthusiasm" (Emerson).

More Faculty Salaries Reported

The following table shows average faculty compensation reported by the institutions too late to be included in the August 25 issue of *The Chronicle*.

These figures, in hundreds of dollars, for the 1979-80 academic year, were compiled by the American Association of University Professors from data collected by the National Center for Education Statistics. They combine salary and fringe benefits for full-time faculty members, adjusted to a nine-month basis.

A blank space indicates that an institution has no faculty members at that rank; a dash (—) indicates that the statistical sample is too small to be significant.

	Prof	Asso Prof	Asst Prof	Inst
COLORADO				
Colo St U, I	30.9	24.7	20.6	16.8
CONNECTICUT				
Sacred Heart U, IIB	27.4	22.2	17.7	—
KANSAS				
Bethany C, IIB	23.0	18.7	16.5	—
MARYLAND				
Anne Arundel CC, III	30.5	25.5	20.6	17.8
MISSOURI				
Drury C, IIA	24.2	18.9	15.9	—
NEW YORK				
CUNY				
Baruch C, IIA	40.7	32.4	25.9	21.3
Manhtn CC, III	39.1	32.4	28.4	19.0
Bronx CC, III	39.2	33.0	29.0	—
Brklyn C, IIA	41.1	32.5	26.1	19.2
City C, IIA	40.3	32.3	26.6	20.5
NEW YORK (Cont'd)				
CUNY				
Grd Sch & U Ctr, I	41.9	32.7	—	
Hostos CC, III	40.3	34.0	27.0	20.8
Hunter C, IIA	40.2	31.5	25.5	19.3
J Jay C Crim Jus, IIA	39.9	31.9	25.5	—
Kingsbrgh CC, III	40.7	34.0	29.2	—
La Guardia CC, III	35.2	28.9	23.3	16.3
Lehman C, IIA	40.8	35.6	27.0	20.5
M Evers C, IIB	37.6	30.6	25.2	19.7
Queens C, IIA	41.2	33.4	27.6	20.7
Queensbrgh CC, III	39.3	33.1	27.4	18.5
C of Stn Island, III	40.8	34.1	29.0	—
York C, IIB	41.0	32.0	25.8	—
Marist C, IIB	28.5	24.9	21.0	—
Pace U, IIA	34.5	28.3	23.4	18.9
PENNSYLVANIA				
U of Pittsburgh, I	39.9	29.0	22.4	15.7
Bradford, III	—	26.8	20.3	14.4
Greensbrg, III	—	23.1	20.6	—
Johnstown, IIB	31.1	25.0	21.0	14.6
Titusville, III	—	21.7	—	

IS THERE
A BOMB IN
YOUR
COMPUTER
ROOM?
Your Current Computer Is Costing Your School Plenty. First, there's information you need to make decisions but you're not getting it. Second, those existing computer programs aren't documented. No one else knows what they do, how to fix them, or how to improve them.
Most Computers Today Can't Give You The Information You Need. Sure, your computer keeps data on students, writes checks, and prints labels. But how fast can you get that unusual report you need to answer a question? Data are facts and figures; records of detailed transactions.
Information Is Much More. For example, can your present system relate data from admissions to alumni so alumni can be involved in the recruiting effort? Does data flow into the financial system from development, billing and payroll automatically? And will you get from the information you need?
It Takes More Than A Computer To Create Information. You need advanced software tools like our QUIMS data management system. And integrated programs for specific solutions. A good computer system is indispensable to your school's success. We can show you how to have one of the best. Call Ken Cerri at 203 / 724-4777.
Quodata
Specialists in DEC Systems
196 TRUMBULL STREET • HARTFORD, CT. 06103